

No. 9/5/84-6Lab/6379. —In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s (i) State Transport Controller, Haryana, Chandigarh (ii) Haryana Roadways, Sirsa:—

BEFORE SHRI B.P. JINDAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, ROHTAK

Reference No. 91 of 83

between

SHRI JAGDISH CHANDER, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. (i) STATE TRANSPORT CONTROLLER, HARYANA, CHANDIGARH (ii) HARYANA ROADWAYS, SIRSA.

Present.

Shri S.S. Goel, Advocate, for the workman.  
Shri V.K. Kohli, L.A., for the management.

#### AWARD

1. In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute, to this Court between Shri Jagdish Chander, workman, and the management of M/s. (i) State Transport Controller, Haryana, Chandigarh (ii) Haryana Roadways, Sirsa, for adjudication, — vide Labour Department Notification No. 17/30918-23, dated 30th June, 1983:—

Whether the termination of service of Shri Jagdish Chander was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

2. On receipt of the order of reference usual notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared. The workman alleged that he was appointed as a clerk-cum-typist with the respondent on 25th October, 1979 on *ad hoc* basis but the services of the workman were illegally terminated on 9th September, 1982 without holding any enquiry. Before a reply could be filed by the respondent the parties arrived at an amicable settlement, whereunder the workman was reinstated and regarding back wages, he had filed appropriate action against the respondent with the authority under Payment of Wages Act, and as such he does not want to prosecute this reference. So, in terms of the settlement arrived at between the parties, this reference is answered and returned accordingly. There is no order as to cost.

Dated the 9th August, 1984.

B. P. JINDAL,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Rohtak.

Endst No. 91-83/2895 dated 7th September, 1984

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour & Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947

B. P. JINDAL,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Rohtak.

No. 9/5/84-6Lab/6380.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Electric Construction & Equipment Co. (Transformer Divn.) Delhi Road, Sonapat:—

BEFORE SHRI B.P. JINDAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, ROHTAK

Reference No. 44 of 83

between

SHRI MOOL CHAND, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. ELECTRIC CONSTRUCTION & EQUIPMENT CO. LTD (TRANSFORMER DIVISION), DELHI ROAD, SONEPAT

Present.

Shri S.N. Solanki, A.R., for the workman.  
Shri Surinder Kaushal A.R., for the management.

## AWARD

1. In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute to this Court, between Shri Mool Chand, workman and the management of M/s. Electric Construction & Equipment Co. Ltd. (Transformer Division), Delhi Road, Sonapat, for adjudication.—vide Labour Department Notification No. 1D/20901-06 dated 4th May, 1983.

Whether the termination of service of Shri Mool Chand was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

2. On receipt of the order of reference, usual notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared. The workman alleged that he was employed as Carpenter by the respondent about 12 years ago but his services were illegally terminated on 13rd July, 1982 in flagrant disregard of the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

3. Before a reply could be filed by the management, settlement was alleged, though no terms of the same were disclosed by the parties. The workman filed an application on 26th May, 1984 alleging that now no dispute is left with the respondent and as such he does not want to prosecute the reference. So no dispute award is given. The reference is answered and returned accordingly. There is no order as to cost.

Dated the 9th August, 1984

B. P. JINDAL,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Rohtak.

Endst No. 44-83/2896, dated 7th September, 1984

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour & Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

B. P. JINDAL,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Rohtak.

No. 9/5/84-6Lab/6381.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s. North Land Rubber Milk Pvt. Ltd., Rai (Sonapat):—

BEFORE SHRI B.P. JINDAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, ROHTAK.

Reference No. 233 of 82

between

SHRI KAILASH SINGH, WORKMAN, AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S NORTH LAND RUBBER MILK PVT. LTD., RAI (SONEPAT)

Present —

Shri S.N. Solanki, A.R., for the workman.

Shri Surinder Kaushal, A.R., for the management.

## AWARD.

1. In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute to this Court, between Shri Kailash Singh, workman, and the management of M/s. North Land Rubber Milk Pvt. Ltd., Rai (Sonapat) for adjudication.—vide Labour Department Notification No. 1D/SPT/43/82/56752—57, dated Nil :—

Whether the termination of service of Shri Kailash Singh was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

2. On receipt of the order of reference, usual notice was issued to the parties. The parties appeared. The workman alleged that he was employed as Welder by the respondent on 3rd April, 1981 on monthly basis of Rs. 240 on a permanent post, but his services were illegally terminated by the management on 7th August, 1982 without complying with the provisions of section 25 (F) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

3. A detailed reply was submitted by the respondent. I need not reiterate the various pleas taken by the respondent, because the parties have arrived at a settlement. The Authorised Representative of the workman Shri S.N. Solanki made a statement in the Court that the workman had settled his claim with the respondent and as such now no dispute survives for adjudication. So no dispute award is rendered. The reference is answered and returned accordingly. There is no order as to cost.

Dated the 9th August, 1984.

B. P. JINDAL,

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Rohtak.

No. 233-82/2898, dated 7th September, 1984

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour & Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

B. P. JINDAL,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Rohtak.

No. 9/5/84-6Lab/6382.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Gawar Gum Chemical Ltd., Dabra Road, Hissar :—

BEFORE SHRI B.P. JINDAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, ROHTAK

Reference No. 160 of 82

between

SHRI RAMJI LAL SHARMA, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S GAWAR GUM CHEMICAL LTD., DABRA ROAD, HISSAR

Present :

Shri T.C. Gupta, A.R., for the workman.  
None, for the management.

AWARD

1. In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana, referred the following dispute, between Shri Ramji Lal Sharma, workman and the management of M/s Gawar Gum Chemical Ltd., Dabra Road, Hissar, to this Court, for adjudication,—vide Labour Department Notification No. IL/HSR/76/82/36339, dated 5th August, 1982 :—

Whether the termination of service of Shri Ramji Lal Sharma was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

2. On receipt of the order of reference, usual notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared. The workman alleged that he was appointed as Electrician in the year 1975 by the respondent and worked as such upto 19th April, 1982, upon which date his services were terminated without any notice or charge-sheet or without complying with the provisions of section 25(F) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. Before a reply could be filed by the respondent, the parties arrived at a settlement, whereunder, the workman was paid a sum of Rs. 2,500 by the respondent in full and final settlement of his claim. The Authorised Representative of the workman Shri T.C. Gupta, made a statement that in view of the settlement arrived at between the parties, the workman does not want to prosecute the reference. So this reference is answered and returned accordingly. There is no order as to cost.

Dated the 9th August, 1984.

B. P. JINDAL,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Rohtak.

Endst No. 160-82/2898, dated 7th September, 1984.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour & Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

B. P. JINDAL,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Rohtak.